



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

<b>Applicant</b>	City of Roseville	<b>County</b>	Placer
<b>Project Title</b>	Western Placer County Groundwater Recharge Mapping and Water Quality Protection Program	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 250,000.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 298,504.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal installs six monitoring wells to measure 10 discrete depth intervals at four locations throughout Western Placer County to contribute water level monitoring data to the collection efforts of CASGEM.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	5
Schedule	5
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>38</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation. The City of Roseville, together with Lincoln, Placer County Water Agency and California American Water, adopted the Western Placer County Groundwater Management Plan) on 9/1/2007.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant offers a detailed description of the project. The applicant described in sufficient detail the goals of the project, the needed facilities, and the area affected. The Applicant demonstrates collaboration with the City of Lincoln, PCWA, and Cal Am, and outlines a clear long-term need for the project. The Applicant specifically demonstrates three areas in which a definite and achievable quantity of new knowledge will be obtained, and explains that Western Placer County Partners have approved funding and are committed to funding groundwater management activities, including ongoing monitoring for the CASGEM program by the City of Roseville.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant’s Work Plan describes in sufficient detail a plan to implement the Groundwater Recharge Mapping and Water Quality Protection Plan, and tasks are consistent with the Schedule and Budget, and can reasonably fulfill the objectives of the proposal. The tasks relate to improving groundwater management and support the GWMP. The Applicant indicates that quarterly progress reports, all project deliverables, and a final program report will be submitted to DWR. An access agreement for the Scarborough Park site is included. All other well locations are owned by the City of Roseville and therefore no access agreement is necessary. The Applicant describes that information will be disseminated to the public and stakeholders via regular quarterly meetings of the WPC. Finally, the Applicant adequately explains a plan for complying with CEQA, obtaining permits, and fulfilling any other applicable regulatory requirements.
- **Budget:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant addresses all the scoring criteria elements and is consistent with both the WP and Schedule.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation. The Applicant adequately addresses all the elements within the scoring criteria.



## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013*

---

- **QA/QC:** The criterion is addressed but is not fully documented. Although the Applicant does an adequate job documenting in a summary table the QA/QC procedures that address Task 4 (Project Evaluation, Design, and Construction), they fail to offer similar data quality assurances for the other tasks, such as those devoted to the Grant Administrative side of the proposed project, such as reviewing progress reports and invoice packages before they are submitted to DWR. Also, specific QA/QC measure(s) to assure accurate data entry into the Data Management System is not included.
  
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The Applicant summarized three past grants with accompanying documentation and narratives to support their past performance history. For the past LGA grant received by the Applicant three amendments for time extensions have been granted, however, no explanation for the cause justifying the third amendment is given. In addition, the Applicant submitted no back-up from a granting agency concerning the satisfactory completion of grant requirements.